

**REMARKS**

Favorable reconsideration of this application as presently amended and in light of the following discussion is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-7 and 9-23 are pending in the present application. Claims 1-7, 9-14, 17 and 19-23 have been amended by the present amendment.

In the outstanding Office Action, claims 20-23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101; claims 1-5, 20 and 21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by Kashiwagi et al.; claims 1, 2 and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by Sujimoto; claim 1 was rejected under U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by Yamauchi et al.; Claims 3-5 and 21 were rejected under U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Sugimoto et al. in view of Yamauchi et al.; Claims 9-19 were allowed; and it appears claims 6-8 were indicated as allowable if rewritten in independent form (i.e., claims 6-8 were listed as being objected to and were not rejected under any cited art).

Applicants thank the Examiner for the indication of allowable subject matter. In light of this indication, claim 6 has been rewritten in independent form. Further, allowed claims 9-19 have been amended only to correct cosmetic minor informalities and have not been amended to further distinguish over any cited art.

In addition, regarding the rejection of claims 20-23 under 35 U.S.C. § 101, claim 20 has been amended to be directed to a recording medium containing recorded data to be reproduced by a video player. These features are supported at least by Figure 6 and the corresponding description in the specification. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested this rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 1-5, 20 and 21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by Kashiwagi et al. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Amended independent claim 1 is directed to a method of recording a data stream including multi-path stream sections in a recording medium including

grouping the multi-path stream sections of the recorded data stream into a single stream object, and providing a mapping list for accessing the multi-path stream sections in the single stream object. Further, the mapping list includes time entry information for identifying a position of each multi-path stream section, in which time entry information for a respective multi-path stream section includes a cumulative sum of time lengths of proceeding multi-path sections having a same path as the respective multi-path section. Independent claim 20 includes similar features in a varying scope. These features are supported at least by Figure 3 and page 7, lines 4-13.

In more detail, according to the present invention, the multi-path stream sections of the recorded data stream are grouped into a single stream object. These features are supported by the HOB 2 in Figure 1. Because of this arrangement, the present invention advantageously provides time entry information for a respective multi-path stream section including a cumulative sum of time lengths of preceeding multi-path sections having a same path as respective multi-path section. Thus, with reference to Figure 1, the cell 5 would be displayed after the cell 3 because the time entry information includes a cumulative sum of time lengths of preceeding multi-path section 3 having a same path as the respective multi-path section 5.

The Office Action indicates Kashiwaga et al. teaches time entries having location information indicating each boundary position between stream segments of different paths and cites column 52, lines 5-20. However, Kashiwaga et al. does not teach or suggest that time entry information for a respective multi-path stream section includes a cumulative sum of time lengths of preceeding multi-path sections having a same path as respective multi-path section.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted independent claims 1 and 20 and each of the claims depending therefrom patentably define over Kashiwaga et al.

Similar comments apply to Sujimoto et al. and Yamauchi et al., used in rejecting claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as noted in the Office Action. That is, neither Sujimoto et al. nor Yamauchi et al. teach or suggest the claimed time entry

information including a cumulative sum of time lengths of preceeding multi-path sections having a same path as the respective multi-path sections. Further, Sugimoto et al. and Yamauchi et al. do not group the multipath-stream sections of the recorded data into a single stream object as in the present invention.

Further, it is respectfully submitted the other rejections noted in the Office Action have also been overcome.

In addition, the specification has been amended to correct minor informalities. It is believed no new matter has been added.

### **CONCLUSION**

In view of the above remarks, it is believed that the claims clearly distinguish over the patents relied on by the Examiner, either alone or in combination.

Since the remaining patents cited by the Examiner have not been utilized to reject the claims, but to merely show the state of the art, no comment need be made with respect thereto.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, reconsideration of the rejections and allowance of all of the claims are respectfully requested.

All of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding rejections and that they be withdrawn. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance.

If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (703) 205-8000 in the Washington, D.C. area.

A prompt and favorable consideration of this Amendment is respectfully requested.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees. In view of the above amendment, applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Dated: February 1, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By Esther H. Chong  
Esther H. Chong  
Registration No.: 40,953  
BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP  
8110 Gatehouse Road  
Suite 100 East  
P.O. Box 747  
Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747  
(703) 205-8000  
Attorney for Applicant